

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

98-P0151US2 (4010/8C1)

Certificate of Electronic Transmission
Under 37 C.F.R. §1.8

I hereby certify that this correspondence and any document referenced herein are being electronically filed with the USPTO via EFS-Web on December 17, 2010.

Nancy Joyce Simmons
(Printed Name of Person Sending Correspondence)

/nancy joyce simmons/
(Signature)

Application Number

10/789,398

Filed

February 27, 2004

First Named Inventor

Kathleen M. Miller

Art Unit

3738

Examiner

Suzette Jaime J. Gherbi

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

applicant /inventor.

/David B. Bonham/
Signature

assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b)
is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)

David B. Bonham
Typed or printed name

attorney or agent of record.

Registration number 34,297

703.433.0510

attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34. _____

Telephone number
December 17, 2010
Date

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.



*Total of 1 forms are submitted.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) – Solomon

Claims 73–74, 84, 95, 97 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Solomon et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,261,271 (Solomon). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

For a reference to anticipate a claim it must disclose *each and every element* of the claim. See MPEP 2131 and cases cited therein. Solomon fails to teach all of the elements of the present invention as claimed in amended independent claim 73, which is directed to

...a first *annular layer comprising a matrix polymer, an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor that form a single distinct matrix polymer region*, a first polymeric barrier layer at least partially covering an interior surface of said first annular layer and a second polymer barrier layer at least partially covering an exterior surface of said first annular layer. (emphasis added).

The Solomon reference fails as an anticipatory reference because it does not disclose *all* of the features of the claimed invention. Specifically, Solomon fails to teach an annular layer that contains *all three components*: matrix polymer, the antimicrobial agent, and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor to form a *single distinct matrix polymer region*. Solomon fails to teach an annular layer that contains all three components within that layer to form one distinct matrix polymer region.

When Solomon speaks of a polymer having a “dual anti-infective activity,” it is not speaking of dual agents in a *single distinct matrix polymer region*. Rather, the “dual” activity is achieved by putting an anti-infective in *two separate layers*—a bulk layer and a surface coating layer. For example, Solomon states that “[t]he preferred catheter of the invention includes a polymer having both bulk distributed chlorhexidine and a chlorhexidine coating. This embodiment of the invention produces a dual anti-infective activity. The surface coating provides a readily available and rapid release of chlorhexidine. The bulk distributed chlorhexidine, due to the hydrophilic nature of the polymer, migrates slowly to the surface when the catheter is in contact with a body fluid and produces anti-infective activity of long duration.” (Solomon et al., col. 6, lines 23–32). Nowhere does Solomon teach a single polymeric matrix region containing *both* an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor. Thus, Solomon fails to teach an element of the claimed invention and fails to anticipate claim 1.

Solomon suffers from a second fundamental deficiency. It fails to teach a “microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.” The Examiner mistakenly states that “chlorhexidine [is] one of the same materials currently disclosed for this purpose.” This statement is factually erroneous. As would be appreciated by one of skill in the art, chlorhexidine is not a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor. Chlorhexidine is correctly identified in Applicant’s specification as an “antimicrobial agent” (see paragraph [0038] of Applicant’s specification). Examples of microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitors are provided in paragraph [0039] of the Applicant’s specification. Chlorhexidine is *not* listed anywhere as a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor. Solomon as well states that chlorhexidine

is an antimicrobial. See Example V (“The antimicrobial-containing [chlorhexidine-containing] tubings of Example I...”). There is simply no evidence to support the Examiner’s assertion that the chlorhexidine of Solomon is one of the same materials currently disclosed for the purpose of a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.

According to the final Office Action, “Applicant wrongly suggests that the claim 1 requires three components, since a single agent can be both an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, as noted above, chlorhexidine is an antimicrobial agent, rather than a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.

Moreover, even assuming for the sake of argument that chlorhexidine happened to be both an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor, such a single agent does not meet the language of claim 73.

“The words of a claim must be given their ‘plain meaning’ unless such meaning is inconsistent with the specification.” See MPEP 2111.01.

In the present case the plain meaning of “a first annular layer comprising an extruded homogenous mixture of a matrix polymer, an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor” is that three distinct entities are present: (a) a matrix polymer, (b) an antimicrobial agent and (c) a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.

The Examiner, on the other hand, is suggesting that applicant ignore the conjunction “and” in the claims. To give an everyday example, “an organic item, a household item and a kitchen item” would not be interpreted by an English-speaking person as being met by “an orange and a knife,” due to the existence of the conjunction “and,” which requires three items. Similarly, a layer “comprising an extruded homogenous mixture of a matrix polymer, an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor” requires three materials: (a) a matrix polymer, (b) an antimicrobial agent and (c) a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor.

The specification is consistent with the plain meaning understanding that “an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor” must correspond to two different entities and cannot be met by a single entity.

Given that the Examiner has adopted a claim construction that is inconsistent with the plain meaning of the claims, it is respectfully submitted that such a claim construction is improper.

For at least the above reasons, claim 73, as well as claims 74, 84, 95, 97 and 103 depending therefrom, are patentable over Solomon under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Modak in view of Solomon

Claims 73-75, 80-90, 94-99 and 103 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modak et al., US 6,224,579 (Modak) in view of Solomon. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 72 and 87, the only independent claims under examination, each requires a stent comprising (a) a polymeric tubular shaft having more than one layer, said polymeric tubular shaft comprising a first annular layer comprising an extruded homogenous mixture of a matrix polymer and one or more bioactive agents (i.e., an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor) that form a single distinct matrix polymer region, (b) a first polymeric barrier layer at least partially covering an interior surface of said first annular layer, and (c) a second polymer barrier layer at least partially covering an exterior surface of said first annular layer.

In the Office Action, the Examiner argues that “Modak et al discloses a ureteral stent (col. 4, lines 16-36) comprising a polymeric tubular shaft having more than one layer (i.e. coating), said polymeric tubular shaft comprising a first annular layer comprising matrix polymer comprising, an antimicrobial agent (tricosan, title), and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor (Ag EDTA, col. 4, lines 3-14)...”

All of the procedures described in Modak result in a medical article having an outer anti-infective region that comprises a polymer, tricosan and a silver compound.

The present invention, on the other hand, requires first and second polymer barrier layers at least partially covering, respectively, interior and exterior surfaces of a first annular layer comprising an extruded homogenous mixture of a matrix polymer and one or more bioactive agents (i.e., an antimicrobial agent and a microbial attachment/biofilm synthesis inhibitor) that form a single distinct matrix polymer region.

In other words, the outer regions described in Modak are anti-infective carrier regions, whereas the outer regions as claimed are barrier regions.

The Examiner also urges that although Modak remains silent as to using extrusion to prepare the tubing and agent resulting in a homogeneous bulk distribution, it “would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the extrusion method of Solomon et al in place of the dip coating method of Modak et al in order to [achieve] distribution of the agent in the base polymer. Such a modification amounts to mere substitution of one agent distribution method for another within the art [sic] of implantable tubing (ureteral stents).” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, dip coating is a room temperature process, whereas extrusion is an elevated temperature process, which is associated with various difficulties including agent degradation, among others.

Moreover, making the Examiner's proposed modifications to the device of Modak would render the device unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

Modak is very clear that a solvent-based dip coating method is critical for success because of the inherent difficulties in creating medical articles with anti-infective coatings. Indeed, Modak states:

Successful treatment of a medical article with a polymer comprising an anti-infective agent may be *problematic*, particularly where the medical article has a hydrophobic surface. The adherence of the polymer may depend upon (1) the polymeric matrix in which the anti-infective agent is suspended; (2) compatibility (or lack thereof) between the agent/polymeric matrix and the surface of the article; (3) the solvent system; and (4) the thickness of polymer/anti-infective agent desirably applied. Furthermore, *the rates of release of various anti-infective agents from diverse polymers may differ*. To address these *issues*, the present invention provides for two different methods for treating medical articles: one-step method, and a two-step method, both of which are set forth below.

Modak et al., col. 5, lines 52-65.

Modak carefully details its one-step and two-step methods, each of which employs solvent-based solutions, for instance, involving "coating, dipping or soaking the article in a treatment solution of a hydrophilic polymer" (col. 6, lines 20-21), "coating, dipping or soaking the article in a treatment solution of a hydrophobic polymer" (col. 6, lines 63-64), or "treat[ing] with a solution comprising one or more silver compounds, triclosan and/or other chlorinated phenol, and optionally containing a biomedical polymer, dissolved in one or more solvents, wherein the solvent(s) selected is (are) capable of swelling the polymeric medical article to be treated; such a solution is referred to herein as an "impregnating solution" (which is a species of treatment solution), and the process by which the article is treated with triclosan and a silver compound is referred to as "impregnation" (col. 7, line 67 to col. 8, line 9).

Relatedly, Modak also make clear that an impregnation-based method is critical for success. In this regard see, e.g., the paragraph spanning cols. 2-3 of Modak (emphasis added):

The present invention is also based, at least in part, on the discovery that the surface of medical articles, especially catheters, *impregnated* with triclosan and silver compounds generally were found to be smoother and shinier in comparison with catheters impregnated with triclosan and chlorhexidine.... Without being bound by any particular theory, it is believed that medical articles of the invention, *by virtue of their smooth surfaces*, may be less physically irritating than prior art devices, may be less likely to provoke fibrinogen and/or fibronectin deposition, and therefore may avoid bacterial colonization.

There is no evidence that such desired results could be achieved by extrusion and, given the fundamental differences between dipcoating and extrusion, such results would not be expected.

Given such teaching as the backdrop, one of skill in the art would not be motivated to dispense with the dip coating solutions of Modak in favor of an extrusion method of Solomon since such substitution would be in contravention of the teachings of Modak.

Further, given that Modak teaches the “problematic” and complex nature of successfully creating a medical device using anti-infective agents (col. 5, lines 52-53), one of ordinary skill in the art would not have a reasonable expectation of success that the claimed invention would result by such substitution.

Given the great differences between imbibing and extrusion techniques and given the disclosures of Modak regarding the problems inherent in successful treatment of medical devices with polymers containing anti-infective agents, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find that the substitution of the dip coating method of Modak with an extrusion method of Solomon to be a “predictable solution” with a “reasonable expectation of success.”

For the reasons above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the claims.

Further Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 76-79 and 91-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modak and Solomon and further in view of Schwarz, U.S. 2001/0022988.

Claims 100-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modak and Solomon and further in view of Buscemi, U.S. 5,693,034.

Claims 102 and 104 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Modak and Solomon and further in view of Falk, U.S. 6,048,844.

These claims are patentable over Modak and Solomon for at least the reasons set forth above. The secondary references, (Schwarz, Buscemi, and Falk) do not make up for these deficiencies.